

## REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed March 23, 2009. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-12 were pending in this Application. Claims 1-12 were rejected. Claim 12 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

### Claim Objections

Claims 3-4 and 12-19 were objected due to the recitation of certain phrases, which the Examiner recommended be replaced with alternative language. Specifically, Claim 3 was objected to as including the indefinite phrase “after being either higher or lower” and Claim 12 was objected to as failing provide antecedent basis for “the current blocker.” Applicants respectfully point out that these objections do not appear relevant to this application and may have been included by mistake. For example, neither of the quoted phrases appear in the claims. Further, independent Claim 12 is the highest numbered claim on file in this application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these objections and allowance of the claims.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 and 11-12 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,274,851 issued to Joseph A. Mulcahy et al. (“Mulcahy”). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art does not teach all of the elements of the claimed embodiment of the invention.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co. Ltd.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that *Mulcahy* does not anticipate the present claims because *Mulcahy* does not teach all the elements of the present Claims. For example, *Mulcahy* does not teach at least the following features of independent Claim 1:

at least one control coil which can be inserted into the high voltage line connected in series, and having at least one switching device which is in each case associated with one control coil, . . .

wherein each switching device is arranged in a parallel path in parallel with the control coil associated with it.

Specifically, *Mulcahy* does not teach a *control coil which can be inserted into the high voltage line connected in series* or a switching device that is *arranged in a parallel path in parallel with the control coil associated with it*. The Examiner cites to furnace transformer 24 and switch 32 of *Mulcahy* as a control coil and switching device, respectively. However, furnace transformer 24 is not *arranged in parallel* with switch 32, but is arranged in series instead; the current travelling through switch 32 is identical to the current travelling through furnace transformer 24. Thus, *Mulcahy* does not teach at least these features of independent Claim 1.

In another example, *Mulcahy* does not teach at least the following features of independent Claim 11, “a switching device which is arranged in a parallel path in parallel with a control coil . . .” As discussed above, the furnace transformer 24 and switch 32 of *Mulcahy* are connected in series and do not teach *a switching device which is arranged in a parallel path in parallel with a control coil*, as required by Claim 11.

In yet another example, *Mulcahy* does not teach at least the following features of independent Claim 12, “using a switching device to bridge a control coil . . .” As discussed above, the furnace transformer 24 and switch 32 of *Mulcahy* are connected in series and do not teach *using a switching device to bridge a control coil*, as required by Claim 11, because a bridge demands a parallel connection.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1, 11, and 12, and Claims 2–10, which depend from Claim 1.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5–7 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mulcahy*.

Claims 8–10 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mulcahy* in view of the acknowledged prior art.

Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 5–7 and 8–10 are patentable over *Mulcahy* and in view of the acknowledged prior art at least because each depends from independent Claim 1.

**Association of Customer Number and Change of Correspondence Address**

Applicants respectfully request that all papers pertaining to the above-captioned patent application be associated with Customer No. **86528**, and direct all correspondence pertaining to this patent application to practitioners at Customer Number **86528**. All telephone calls should be directed to Eric M. Grabski at 512.457.2030. A Revocation and Power of Attorney will be filed shortly.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4871 of King & Spalding L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.457.2030.

Respectfully submitted,  
KING & SPALDING L.L.P.  
Attorney for Applicants

*E M. Grabski*

Eric M. Grabski  
Registration No. 51,749

Date: June 19, 2009

**SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:**  
KING & SPALDING L.L.P.  
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **86528**  
512.457.2030  
512.457.2100 (fax)